FCC-HOUSTON

713 861 0476 P.02 WW 96-173



Federal Communications Commission Compliance and Information Bureau 1225 North Loop West, Suite 900 Houston, TX 77008 July 24, 1995

Chameleon Radio Corporation 10865 Rockley Road Houston, TX 77099

Written Reply Required

Ref#: HU-9500643

OFFICIAL NOTICE OF VIOLATION

This is an Official Notice of Violation issued in accordance with Section 1.89 of the Commission's rules (47 C.F.R. §1.89), to Chameleon Radio Corporation for violation of the terms of the Special Temporary Authority granted on May 12, 1995 and Section 73.1560(a) of the Commission's Rules (47 C.F.R. §73.1560(a)).

On June 17, June 23, June 29, and July 6, 1995, an agent from the Commission's Compliance and Information Bureau conducted field strength measurements on the radio signal of station KFCC (1270KHz). A list of the measurements are shown in the appendix. The measurements reveal that KFCC was operating beyond the terms of the Special Temporary Authority (STA) granted on May 12, 1995. The STA was granted to Chameleon Radio Corporation to operate the station with a maximum daytime power of 300 watts and a maximum nighttime power of 50 watts. The measurements show that the station failed to reduce their operating power from the daytime to the nighttime mode. Therefore, the station was found operating grossly overpower during the nighttime operating hours on June 17, 1995, June 23, 1995, and June 29, 1995.

Field strength measurements were conducted at four different points from KFCC's antenna element. The field strength levels at each particular point were essentially the same for day and night operation of the station. The measurements indicate that there was no change in the operating power level of the station from daytime to nighttime operation on June 17, June 23, and June 29, 1995. Daytime field strength measurements were also conducted on July 6, 1995 (9:23AM-9:55AM), just before the inspection of the station. These field strength measurements made before the inspection on July 6, 1995, showed essentially the same operating power level as was used during the nights of June 17, June 23, and June 29, 1995.

On July 6, 1995, an inspection of the station was conducted during daytime hours by representatives from the FCC. At the time of the inspection, the antenna input power of the station was measured at 342 watts using the indirect method. Upon FCC request, station personnel adjusted the transmitter to their low power nighttime operating mode.

^{&#}x27;The transmitter plate current was measured at 6.75 amps and the plate voltage at 59 volts. The manufactures transmitter efficiency factor as stated from KFCC's station engineer was 86 percent. Using the indirect power formula in 47 C.F.R. §73.51(e), the antenna input power calculates to 342 watts for the daytime operating mode.

Field strength measurements were conducted while the station was in the nighttime low power mode. The field strength of KFCC's radio signal was measured at the previous defined points at approximately 1.0KM, 1.0KM, 1.3KM, 2.7KM, from the vertical antenna of KFCC. The field strength was measured at 80mV/m, 70mV/m, 50mV/m, and 26.5mV/m, respectively. The field strength levels were significantly lower compared to the field strength levels measured on the night hours on the 17th, 23rd, and 29th of June at the same distinct points. These field strength measurements clearly indicate that the station had operated at a power level grossly exceeding the authorized nighttime power of 50 watts during nighttime hours on June 17, June 23, and June 29, 1995.

The expected groundwave field strength can be calculated for a simple vertical 180 foot non-directional antenna using figure 8 of 47 C.F.R. §73.190, and the graphs referenced in 47 C.F.R. §73.184. The expected groundwave field strength for 50 watts of power at approximately 1KM, 1.3KM, and 2.7KM, is 67mV/m, 52mV/m, and 25mV/m, respectively³. The field strength levels measured on the nighttime hours on June 17, June 23, and June 29, 1995, far exceeded the expected groundwave field strengths for 50 watts of power at these distances.

Pursuant to Section 1.89 of the Commission's Rules, 47 C.F.R. §1.89, Chameleon Radio Corporation, shall within 10 days upon receipt of this notice submit a written statement concerning the violation of overpower operation during the nighttime operating hours of June 17, June 23, and June 29, 1995, to the address in the letterhead. The response for the violation shall be complete in itself, and shall describe the action taken to correct and prevent continuation or recurrence of the violation. Please indicate the reference number on your response.

Violations, if repeated or willful, as well as a failure to reply to this notice, may result either in the imposition of monetary forfeitures, the revocation of your station license or suspension of operator license. (See Section 503, 312, and 303(m) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, and Section 1.89 of the Commission's Rules.)

The knowing and willful making of any false statement in reply to this Notice is punishable by fine or imprisonment under Title 18, United States Code, Section 1001.

The Privacy Act of 1974, P.L. 93-579, December 31, 1974, 5 U.S.C. 552a(e)(3) requires that we advise you that the Commission's staff will use all relevant and material information before it, including the information disclosed in your reply to determine what, if any, enforcement action is required to ensure current and future rule compliance.

Kennard J. Adamcik

Issuing Officer

Stephen P. Lee

Acting Engineer-In-Charge

² The transmitter plate current was measured at 3.25 amps and the plate voltage at 27 volts. Using the indirect power formula in 47 C.F.R. §73.51(e), the antenna input power calculates to 75 watts for the low power mode.

³ The expected field strengths were calculated using the maximum conductivity (5000 mmhos/m) given in the charts. Please note that the actual ground conductivity around the antenna would be lower; therefore resulting in a lower value for the expected field strength.

APPENDIX

FIELD STRENGTH MEASUREMENT DATA OF STATION KFCC

Date & Time Field Strength Measured

Point Location - (approx. 1.0 Kilometer SE from antenna) 6/17/95 8:14PM 170 mV/m 6/17/95 7:33PM 175 mV/m 6/17/95 9:38PM 175 mV/m 6/17/95 10:34PM 175 mV/m 6/23/95 7:07PM 6/23/95 7:47PM 6/23/95 9:43PM 178 mV/m 178 mV/m 181 mV/m 6/29/95 6:48PM 178 mV/m 8/29/95 7:17PM 6/29/95 9:45PM 181 mV/m 182 mV/m 7/06/95 9:39AM 180 mV/m 7/06/95 11:51AM 80 mV/m (low power mode)

Point Location - (approx. 1.0 Kilometer N from antenns) 6/29/95 7:04PM 165 mV/m 6/29/95 7:48PM 162 mV/m 6/29/95 9:37PM 161 mV/m

> 7/06/95 9:26AM 164 mV/m

7/6/95 12:11PM 70 mV/m (low power mode)

Point Location- (approx. 1.3 Kilometers from antenna) 6/17/95 7:00PM 110 mV/m 6/17/95 7:49PM 110 mV/m 6/17/95 9:56PM 112 mV/m 6/17/95 10:51PM 6/23/95 7:21PM 112 mV/m 110 mV/m 6/23/95 7:51PM 6/23/95 9:56PM 112 mV/m 112 mV/m 6/29/95 6:26PM 6/29/95 7:33PM 110 mV/m 112 mV/m 112 mV/m 6/29/95 9:55PM

> 7/06/95 9:55AM 112 mV/m

7/06/95 11:59AM 50 mV/m (low power mode)

Point Location - (approx. 2.7 Kilometers from antenna)

6/23/95 6:40PM 6/23/95 7:29PM 62 mV/m 61 mV/m 6/23/95 9:34PM 6/29/96 6:35PM 6/29/95 7:36PM 61 mV/m 61 mV/m 62 mV/m 6/29/95 9:32PM 63 mV/m

62 mV/m

7/06/95 9:23AM 7/06/95 12:05PM 26.5 mV/m (low power mode)

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

1225 North Loop West, Suite 900 77008 Houston, TX

WARNING

CERTIFIED MAIL NO.P881 067 592 RETURN RECEIPT REQUESTED

1. Name and Address of Licensee

Chameleon Radio Corporation 10865 Rockley Road Houston, TX 77099

Location of Station or Name of Craft	3. Cail Sign	4. Radio Service or Clean of Station	5. Dute(s) of Violation	6. Data Correspondence Matted or Served
Bay City, TX	KFCC	BS	6/17/95,6/23/95 6/29/95	7/24/95

This refers to your failure to submit a response to:

XX Official Notice of Violation (COX) ECONOMICS.

Continuation of Notice of Violation (FCC Form 789),

a copy of which is attached.

By failing to respond, you have violated Section 1.89 of the Commission's Rules.

Any violation, if repeated or willful, as well as your failure to teply to this Warning, may result in either the imposition of monetary forfeitures, the revocation of station license, or suspension of operator license. (See Sections 503, 312, and 303(m) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, and Section 1.89 of the Commission's Rules.)

You are again requested to submit a reply concerning the item marked above. Your reply should be mailed, within ten days of your receipt of this letter, to FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION at the address shown above and should contain an explanation of your failure to file a timely response. Additionally, a full explanation of each of the violations set forth in the item marked above and a detailed statement of the action taken to prevent a continuation or recurrence of each violation alleged to have occurred should be included.

Loyd P. Perry

Supervisory Engineer

8/28/95 Dete

REFER TO OTHER SIDE FOR PRIVACY ACT STATEMENT

The knowing and willful making of any false statement in reply to this NOTICE is punishable by fine or imprisonment under Title 18, United States Code, Section 1001-



Federal Communications Commission Compliance and Information Bureau 1225 North Loop West, Suite 900 Houston, TX 77008 July 24, 1995

Chameleon Radio Corporation 10865 Rockley Road Houston, TX 77099

Written Reply Required

Ref#: HU-9500643

OFFICIAL NOTICE OF VIOLATION

This is an Official Notice of Violation issued in accordance with Section 1.89 of the Commission's rules (47 C.F.R. §1.89), to Chameleon Radio Corporation for violation of the terms of the Special Temporary Authority granted on May 12, 1995 and Section 73.1560(a) of the Commission's Rules (47 C.F.R. §73.1560(a)).

On June 17, June 23, June 29, and July 6, 1995, an agent from the Commission's Compliance and Information Bureau conducted field strength measurements on the radio signal of station KFCC (1270KHz). A list of the measurements are shown in the appendix. The measurements reveal that KFCC was operating beyond the terms of the Special Temporary Authority (STA) granted on May 12, 1995. The STA was granted to Chameleon Radio Corporation to operate the station with a maximum daytime power of 300 watts and a maximum nighttime power of 50 watts. The measurements show that the station failed to reduce their operating power from the daytime to the nighttime mode. Therefore, the station was found operating grossly overpower during the nighttime operating hours on June 17, 1995, June 23, 1995, and June 29, 1995.

Field strength measurements were conducted at four different points from KFCC's antenna element. The field strength levels at each particular point were essentially the same for day and night operation of the station. The measurements indicate that there was no change in the operating power level of the station from daytime to nighttime operation on June 17, June 23, and June 29, 1995. Daytime field strength measurements were also conducted on July 6, 1995 (9:23AM-9:55AM), just before the inspection of the station. These field strength measurements made before the inspection on July 8, 1995, showed essentially the same operating power level as was used during the nights of June 17, June 23, and June 29, 1995.

On July 6, 1995, an inspection of the station was conducted during daytime hours by representatives from the FCC. At the time of the inspection, the antenna input power of the station was measured at 342 watts using the indirect method. Upon FCC request, station personnel adjusted the transmitter to their low power nighttime operating mode.

¹ The transmitter plate current was measured at 6.75 amps and the plate voltage at 59 volts. The manufactures transmitter efficiency factor as stated from KFCC's station engineer was 86 percent. Using the indirect power formula in 47 C.F.R. §73.51(e), the antenna input power calculates to 342 watts for the daytime operating mode.

Field strength measurements were conducted while the station was in the nighttime low power mode. The field strength of KFCC's radio signal was measured at the previous defined points at approximately 1.0KM, 1.0KM, 1.3KM, 2.7KM, from the vertical antenna of KFCC. The field strength was measured at 80mV/m, 70mV/m, 50mV/m, and 26.5mV/m, respectively. The field strength levels were significantly lower compared to the field strength levels measured on the night hours on the 17th, 23rd, and 29th of June at the same distinct points. These field strength measurements clearly indicate that the station had operated at a power level grossly exceeding the authorized nighttime power of 50 watts during nighttime hours on June 17, June 23, and June 29, 1995.

The expected groundwave field strength can be calculated for a simple vertical 180 foot non-directional antenna using figure 8 of 47 C.F.R. §73.190, and the graphs referenced in 47 C.F.R. §73.184. The expected groundwave field strength for 50 watts of power at approximately 1KM, 1.3KM, and 2.7KM, is 67mV/m, 52mV/m, and 25mV/m, respectively³. The field strength levels measured on the nighttime hours on June 17, June 23, and June 29, 1995, far exceeded the expected groundwave field strengths for 50 watts of power at these distances.

Pursuant to Section 1.89 of the Commission's Rules, 47 C.F.R. §1.89, Chameleon Radio Corporation, shall within 10 days upon receipt of this notice submit a written statement concerning the violation of overpower operation during the nighttime operating hours of June 17, June 23, and June 29, 1995, to the address in the letterhead. The response for the violation shall be complete in itself, and shall describe the action taken to correct and prevent continuation or recurrence of the violation. Please indicate the reference number on your response.

Violations, if repeated or willful, as well as a failure to reply to this notice, may result either in the imposition of monetary forfeitures, the revocation of your station license or suspension of operator license. (See Section 503, 312, and 303(m) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, and Section 1.89 of the Commission's Rules.)

The knowing and willful making of any false statement in reply to this Notice is punishable by fine or imprisonment under Title 18, United States Code, Section 1001.

The Privacy Act of 1974, P.L. 93-579, December 31, 1974, 5 U.S.C. 552a(e)(3) requires that we advise you that the Commission's staff will use all relevant and material information before it, including the information disclosed in your reply to determine what, if any, enforcement action is required to ensure current and future rule compliance.

Kennard J. Adamcik

Issuing Officer

Stephen P. Lee

Acting Engineer-In-Charge

² The transmitter plate current was measured at 3.25 amps and the plate voltage at 27 volts. Using the indirect power formula in 47 C.F.R. §73.51(e), the antenna input power calculates to 75 watts for the low power mode.

³ The expected field strengths were calculated using the maximum conductivity (5000 mmhos/m) given in the charts. Please note that the actual ground conductivity around the antenna would be lower; therefore resulting in a lower value for the expected field strength.

APPENDIX

FIELD STRENGTH MEASUREMENT DATA OF STATION KFCC

Date & Time Field Strength Measured

```
Point Location - (approx. 1.0 Kilometer SE from antenna)
            CAUCH - (APPROX. 1.
8/17/95 6:14PM
6/17/95 7:33PM
6/17/95 9:38PM
6/17/95 10:34PM
6/23/95 7:77PM
                                                     170 mV/m
                                                    175 mV/m
175 mV/m
175 mV/m
                                                     178 mV/m
             6/23/95 7:47PM
6/23/95 9:43PM
                                                     178 mV/m
                                                     181 mV/m
             6/29/95 5:48PM
6/29/95 7:17PM
6/29/95 9:45PM
                                                     178 mV/m
                                                     181 mV/m
                                                      182 mV/m
              7/06/95 9:39AM
                                                     180 mV/m
              7/06/95 11:51AM
                                                      80 mV/m (low power mode)
```

Point Location - (approx. 1.0 Kilometer N from antenna) 6/29/95 7:04PM 165 mV/m 6/29/95 7:48PM 162 mV/m 6/29/95 9:37PM 181 mV/m

> 7/06/95 9:26AM 7/6/95 12:11PM 164 mV/m

70 mV/m (low power mode)

Point Location- (approx. 1.3 Kilometers from antenna) 6/17/95 7:00PM 110 mV/m 6/17/95 7:40PM 110 mV/m 6/17/95 9:58PM 112 mV/m 6/17/95 9:56PM 6/17/95 10:51PM 6/23/95 7:21PM 6/23/95 7:51PM 6/23/95 9:56PM 6/29/95 6:26PM 6/29/95 7:33PM 6/29/95 9:55PM 112 mV/m 110 mV/m 112 mV/m 112 mV/m 110 mV/m 112 mV/m 112 mV/m

112 mV/m

7/06/95 9:55AM 7/06/95 11:59AM 50 mV/m (low power mode)

Point Location - (approx. 2.7 Kilometers from antenna) 6/23/95 6:40PM 62 mV/m 6/23/95 7:29PM 61 mV/m 6/23/96 9:34PM 61 mV/m 6/29/95 6:35PM 61 mV/m 6/29/95 7:36PM 62 mV/m 6/29/95 9:32PM 63 mV/m

> 7/06/95 9:23AM 62 mV/m

7/06/95 12:05PM 26.5 mV/m (low power mode)



September 18,1995

Loyd P. Perry, Supervisory Engineer Federal Communications Commission Field Operations Bureau, Houston 1225 North Loop West, Suite 900 Houston, Texas 77008

Re: HU-9500643

Certified Mail Receipt No.: Z 695 180 775

Dear Mr. Perry:

In reply to your letter of July 24,1995 regarding power violations at the STA transmitter location of KFCC, please be informed that, following inspection by Kennard J. Adamcick and Stephen P. Lee, Chameleon Radio Corporation conducted an internal inquiry to determine the source of its failure to reduce power to the required 50 watts on the dates indicated in your Official Notice of Violation.

The results of the inquiry resulted in the discovery that the licensed operator in charge of the transmitter during the periods in question was improperly instructed as to the use of the remote control system which had been installed with the construction of the STA site in rural Harris County, Texas. While the operator believed he was lowering power to the required 50 watts, he in fact, was utilizing a function of the Sine Systems RF-1B remote control to marginally lower the power from the 300 watts daytime power resulting in a power level of between 275 and 290 watts instead of the required 50 watts night operation.

HOUSTON TEXAS

SEP 1 1 1995

Inasmuch as the operator had never before operated a remote control similar to the unit in use at KFCC and no remote control had been utilized by Chameleon nor its sister company KENR Management Company in the operation of KENR AM (1070 kHz, Houston, Texas) {note: KENR had been operated under an LMA prior to May 9,1995 and had been controlled by the licensee, not Chameleon or KENR Management Company, Inc.}, the error is understandable.

Following the inspection on July 6,1995, Chameleon instituted several changes to insure that such a problem does not reoccur. First, all control room operators were reinstructed as to the operation of the remote control and the methods used to raise and lower the station's power. Each operator was required to show proficiency at such operations as well as the taking and logging of transmitter constants. Second, the station's chief operator was instructed to make weekly inspections of transmitter logs to make certain no future occurrences similar to those found by Mr.'s Adamcik and Lee would occur. And finally, the station's program director was instructed to make a check of the transmitter's operating parameters both at morning power up time and during the evening hours at power down time as a double check to make certain the operator on duty had properly made changes in the transmitter's operating constants as required by the rules.

Chameleon Radio Corporation is committed to strict compliance with the Commission's rules regarding operating constants and while the lapses in the instant case were in fact, the mistakes of an individual operator, Chameleon takes full responsibility for the violations cited in your letter and will continue to take all actions necessary to see to it these violations do not occur again.

Respectfully submitted

Don Werlinger, President

cc:

KFCC Public Inspection File

\$00 Maric 3.5071014

Jul 76 13 50 MFEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION Washington, D.C. 20554

JUL 2 5 1995

In Reply Refer To: 1800B3-KDY

VIA TELECOPIER AND CERTIFIED MAIL-RETURN RECEIPT REQUESTED

Mr. Don Werlinger,
President
Chameleon Radio Corporation
10865 Rockley Road
Houston, Texas 77099

In re: KFCC(AM) Bay City, Texas (formerly KIOX(AM)) Letter of Inquiry

Dear Mr. Werlinger:

On May 5, 1995, the Commission granted Chameleon Radio Corporation ("Chameleon") a special temporary authority ("STA") to operate station KFCC(AM) at variance from its licensed parameters.¹ As set forth in greater detail below, on May 25, 1995, the Chief, Audio Services Division, Mass Media Bureau, stayed a recision of that STA grant pending a further clarification of the record.² In addition, since the entry of the stay, two licensees have filed objections complaining of, among other things, electrical interference caused by KFCC(AM)'s STA operation. This letter seeks further information from Chameleon.

<u>Background</u>. Station KFCC(AM) is licensed to serve Bay City, Texas, on 1270 kHz with a transmitter power of 1000 watts (DA-N), from a site 5.8 km northeast of Bay City, Texas ("Bay City Site"). The Commission's records indicate that KFCC(AM)'s main studio is located at the Bay City Site.

On April 18, 1995, the Commission approved an application assigning KFCC(AM)

The subject STA expires on August 1, 1995.

² Pursuant to 47 C.F.R. § 73.1635(a)(5)(b), the Commission may modify or cancel without prior notice or hearing any STA.

from Landrum Enterprises ("Landrum")³ to Chameleon (BAL-950216EA). Documents associated with the application provide that Chameleon would, upon consummation, assume an existing lease for the Bay City Site from Landrum and then, simultaneously, sublease the Bay City Site back to Landrum. Those documents do not indicate whether Chameleon maintains a post-consummation right to the Bay City Site. On May 11, 1995, Landrum filed a letter with the Commission stating that the subject transaction had been consummated. The letter did not, however, identify the actual date of consummation.

Meanwhile, on April 21, 1995, Chameleon, filed a request for STA, describing itself as KFCC(AM)'s licensee. Chameleon claimed a need to relocate the station's transmitter "[d]ue to the loss of its currently licensed site." Chameleon proposed to operate from "rural southwest Harris County" ("Harris County Site") at coordinates N29-38-10, W95-32-22 and requested authority to operate nondirectionally at 1000 watts day, 250 watts night. Chameleon further proposed "to utilize a [180'] tower supporting a folded unipole antenna system." Chameleon also stated that, on April 20, 1995, it sought "FAA authority to construct." Claiming that the STA operation will produce no prohibited overlap - "with the exception of KWHI(AM), Brenham, Texas" - Chameleon stated that it intended to file an FCC Form 301 application to seek permanent authority for operations from the Harris County Site. Pursuant to an oral conversation with the Commission staff, Mr. Werlinger was informed that this STA could not be granted because it appeared to involve construction of a new tower.

In response, on May 2, 1995, Chameleon amended its STA request. Chameleon submitted an amended Figure E-1 correcting the coordinates of the "existing 180' tower" to N29-38-14, W95-32-24. Chameleon stated that "[t]he tower in our original proposal will be the center tower of what will be a three tower array." Chameleon also stated that it intended to file an FCC Form 301 "within 30 days of placing the STA on the air."

On May 5, 1995, the Commission staff granted Chameleon STA to operate with the parameters described in the initial STA request. That letter indicated that the staff believed the STA site to be only 0.25 km from the licensed site.⁴ After further study, though, on May 12, 1995, the Commission staff superseded its May 5 letter to instead specify the amended STA tower coordinates and to reduce KFCC(AM)'s operating power to 300 watts daytime and 50 watts nighttime. Subsequently, on May 18, 1995, the Commission staff issued a letter to Chameleon rescinding the STA ("Rescission Letter"). The Commission staff stated that further study had revealed that KFCC(AM) could not cover its community of license, Bay

³ Landrum remains the licensee of station KIOX(FM). Commission records indicate that KIOX(FM) operates from a site 39.4 km southwest of Bay City and that the KIOX(FM) main studio is located on the Bay City Site.

⁴ This statement in the May 5th letter is incorrect and was the result of inadvertent staff error in interpreting Chameleon's amended Figure E-1.

City, Texas, from the Harris County Site in apparent contravention of 47 C.F.R. 73.24(i). The Recision Letter, however, was stayed on May 25, 1995 by action of the Chief, Audio Services Division, Mass Media Bureau, pending further clarification of the record.

Two licensees have filed objections requesting cancellation of the subject STA. In letters dated May 23, 1995 and June 20, 1995, South Texas Broadcasting, Inc. ("South Texas")⁵ alleges that the subject STA violates "clear technical standards" as the STA site is located approximately fifty (50) miles from the Bay City Site, causes prohibited interference to stations KESS(AM), Fort Worth, Texas and KWHI(AM), Brenham, Texas, and does not provide coverage of KFCC(AM)'s community of license. South Texas further contends that documents associated with Chameleon's recent assignment application indicates that Chameleon voluntarily assigned away to Landrum the right to use KFCC(AM)'s licensed site. The second objection comes from a July 20, 1995, "Petition for Immediate Cancellation of STA" filed by Tom S. Whitehead, Inc. ("Whitehead").⁶ Whitehead contends that Chameleon has not justified the need for an alternative site and that grant of STA to operate at the Harris County Site "is inappropriate and ultra vires." Whitehead also attaches a technical study, supported by affidavit, alleging that "more than 100,000 people in KWHI's primary groundwave service contour who previously did not experience interference from KFCC now receive interference from KFCC."⁷

<u>Discussion/Inquiry</u>. Section 73.1635(a) of the Commission's Rules provides for the issuance of an "STA to a licensee to permit the operation of a broadcast facility for a limited period at a specific variance from the terms of the station authorization or requirements of the FCC rules applicable to the particular class of station." 47 C.F.R. §1635(a). Any STA request must "fully describe the proposed operation and the necessity for the requested STA." 47 C.F.R. § 73.1635(a)(2). In view of the facts presented above, we require the further information set forth below.

First, when an applicant requests an STA pursuant to a transmitter site "loss", our policy is to require that the site "loss" be beyond the applicant's control before granting STA. Chameleon's STA request does not fully describe the factors concerning the "loss" of the Bay City Site. Therefore, please address the following:

1. Provide specific details concerning: (a) the circumstances under which

South Texas is the licensee of KENR(AM), Houston, Texas,

Whitehead is the licensee of KWHI(AM), Brenham, Texas.

Our review of this technical study indicates, however, that Whitehead bases his conclusion on a contour overlap study rather than an interference study. Only a portion of the area receiving overlap receives interference. Additionally, at least some of the data relied upon in the study do not meet the Commission's technical standards for proper analysis due to the lack of sufficient number of measurement points.

Chameleon "lost" the Bay City Site and the date that the "loss" occurred; (b) Chameleon's present legal right of access to the Bay City Site in view of the sublease given to Landrum; (c) the present status of the KFCC(AM) transmission facility at the Bay City Site, and if the status has been changed, the date of any such change and all details concerning the nature and extent of that change; and (d) the present address of the KFCC(AM) main studio.

Second, in cases where the applicant's proposed STA operations do not allow for the continued placement of a principal community contour over the applicant's licensed community, we require that the applicant demonstrate that are no other sites available to better serve the community of license. As noted above, the staff has concluded that KFCC(AM) does not provide principal community coverage to Bay City in accordance with the Commission's Rules. Furthermore, we note that Chameleon has failed to state whether it has investigated the availability of other sites to better serve Bay City. Therefore, please address the following:

2. Furnish a showing demonstrating that no better site - other than the Harris County Site - exists from which KFCC(AM) can maintain coverage as closely as possible to the licensed service, including principal community contour coverage of Bay City, Texas.

Third, operations authorized under STA, absent the filing of a formal application, are specifically "temporary" in nature. See 47 C.F.R. § 73.3516. For an STA necessitated by technical problems, a grant of STA may be restricted to an initial period not to exceed 90 days, with only a limited number of extensions permitted. See 47 C.F.R. § 73.1635(a)(4). Recognizing that operations pursuant to a STA are intended to be limited, and mindful of Section 319(a)'s statutory prohibition against premature construction, we are disinclined to grant such authority in cases where the applicant intends a construction of permanent facilities. For this reason, the staff denied Chameleon's initial STA request on April 21, 1995 because it did not specify operations on an existing site. Chameleon's second request, however, appears to have indicated that operations could be commenced from an "existing 180' foot tower." Because the record is unclear as to whether Chameleon constructed the above-referenced tower in the interval between the staff's oral denial of the initial request, and Chameleon's May 12, 1995 submission of the amended request, please provide the

⁸ Section 73.1635's statutory origin is found in Section 309(f) of the Communications Act of 1943, as amended (Commission may authorize operations pursuant to "temporary authority" under "extraordinary circumstances").

[&]quot;The overriding Congressional concern underlying Section 319 was the prejudicial effect that a substantial expenditure of funds for construction would have on the Commission's consideration of a particular application." <u>Patton Communications Corp.</u>, 48 RR2d 349 (1980).

following information for the Harris County Site:

Provide: (a) the name, address and telephone number of the site owner; (b) any 3. lease or written agreement providing for Chameleon's access to the site; (c) whether Chameleon's principals, or its officers or directors, directly or indirectly, ordered construction of a tower on that site and if so, the date construction of the tower began; (d) the name, address and telephone number of the tower construction contractor; and (e) provide a copy of the FAA filing discussed in the April 21, 1995 STA request and a copy of the FAA Determination of No Hazard.

Finally, although the Commission was notified that the consummation of the assignment of KFCC(AM) to Chameleon had occurred, the exact date that consummation occurred was not identified. Therefore, please provide the following:

Provide the exact date of consummation of the assignment of KFCC(AM) from 4. Landrum to Chameleon (BAL-950216EA).

Please file the above-requested information within ten (10) days of the date hereof. As noted above, the subject STA expires on August 1, 1995. For administrative convenience, we will extend the subject STA to cover this ten-day period. Further extensions will not be comtemplated absent a sufficient showing that an extension is warranted. Please file a copy of your response with the Office of Secretary to the attention of Mr. James Burtle. Also, please simultaneously file a copy of your response by facsimile to Mr. James Burtle at 202-418-1410. A courtesy copy of your response must also be served upon counsels for South Texas and Whitehead.

Audio Services Division

arry D. Eads, Chief

Mass Media Bureau

James P. Riley, Esquire cc: John Joseph McVeigh, Esquire CIB Houston

Facsimile Cover Sheet

KFCC Radio 1270 AM

10865 Rockley Road Houston, Texas 77099

To: Larry Eads

Company: Federal Communications Commis sion

Phone:

Fax:

From: Vickey Scott

Company: KFCC Radio

Phone: (713) 575-1270

Fax: (713) 564-8653

Date: 8/11/95

Total Pages:

70

Comments:

Per your faxed letter this morning:

Mr. Werlinger is not in the office today; however, I have contacte it him and he stated that the enclosed response was sent for to your office last Friday, August 4,1995. He asked me to fax this copy to you this porning. He will be contacting you personally regarding this matter.

Thank you,

Viety Start



7135648653

10865 Rockley Road Houston, TX 77099 P.O. Box 1235 Staffi b, TX 77497 Houston's Unique Talk and International Langue ge Station

August 4,1995

Larry D. Eads, Chief Audio Services Division Mass Media Bureau Federal Communications Commission 1919 M St., N.W. Washington, D.C. 20554

Re: Letter of Inquiry 1800B3-KDY (KFCC - AM, Bay City, Texas)

Dear Mr. Eads:

This narrative and the attached exhibits are offered in response to yo | Letter of Inquiry issued to Chameleon Radio Corporation (Chameleon) # 1800B3-KI Y dated July 25,1995.

Radio

site a

Regarding the Special Temporary Authorization (STA) granted May 1,1995 (as amended May 12,1995), Chameleon Radio Corporation filed a request for entension of that STA on August 4,1995. On that same date, (August 4,1995), Chamelec Corporation filed with the an FCC Form 301 request to make the current ST permanent location for the KFCC day and night operation specifying 2.5 kw operation and 8.50 kw Night operation with different day and night constant (a copy of that application is transmitted herewith). The Form 301 also requests a char le of the city of license for KFCC to Missouri City, Texas as provided by the Commissio s rules.

Your Letter of Inquiry seeks to set the record straight on actions take Chameleon in order to secure the currently effective STA for KFCC Radio (brmerly KIOX). The documents and information requested are attached as exhibits: response and we will address each of them in order. Beyond those document Chameleon also submits additional information and documents which it fee more clearly develop the record regarding actions taken by Chameleon and those licensees which, taken as a whole support Chameleon's actions and further apport Chameleon's request for an extension of its STA and immediate approval of make the major changes in KFCC which are included in its currently pendir application.

Day by this

f other

its request to

form 301

Chameleon submits and the enclosed information clearly demonstrat | that it was the actions by Susquehanna Radio Corporation and more particularly Salem Communications, which led to the extraordinary efforts of Chameleon to say both its business and the broadcast outlet it had developed for international language programmers in the Houston market. Susquehanna Radio Corp is involved to the extent that it terminated a five year LMA agreement only seven months into the part. Salem is involved to the extent that is has systematically and with malice of forethour it set about destroying first the business of KENR Management Company, Inc., and their that of its sister company Chameleon Radio Corporation. The very fact that Salem wa first and until only three weeks ago, the only entity to object to Chameleon's STA with KFCC will be shown to clearly demonstrate that Salem has been engaged and continues to be engaged in competitive strike activities aimed at nothing more than destroying the financial viability of Chameleon.

To that end, Chameleon submits Exhibit: 1 which is a narrative explaining Chameleon's actions and those taken by sister company KENR Managemen Company, Inc. (the principals of both companies are identical). This narrative explains the efforts of KENR Management to provide commercial programming opportunities for hnic groups which prior to KENR Management's arrival in the market had simply not be in available. It explains the fact that KENR Management entered into a Five Year (60 mc 1th) Time Brokerage Agreement (LMA) with Susquehanna Radio Corporation (Susquehanna) then licensee of Radio Station KENR, Houston, Texas (1070 kHz, 10 kw-D, 5 kv N, U, DA-2) on April 1,1994.

In order to meet the Commission's requirements, the Time Brokerag Agreement maintained a ninety (90) day cancellation clause which would allow the lice see to terminate the agreement. Though this language is standard, KENR Manage lent received verbal assurances from Susquehanna that no efforts would be made to sell K INR during the term of the LMA, allowing KENR Management to, in turn, make commitments to programmers wishing to place programming on the station.

The narrative explains KENR Management's efforts in making airtir available to ethnic groups and organizations which had never before in Houston had t opportunity to broadcast news, community events, and religious views and pinions in their native language. The effort resulted in more than 40 programmers repulsenting 11 nationalities from five continents establishing programming on KENR in the first six months on the air. These programmers exhibited a high demand for a comn proval broadcast outlet upon which to express their views as well as a faith in KEN Management's ability to remain on the air and provide them the services ne issary to sustain the programming. KENR Management, relying on its five year corr. hitment with Susquehanna, committed its resources and total effort to providing that service to the programmers.

On November 7,1994, only seven months after KENR Management' commencing programming on KENR, KENR Management was informed by Susquehanna that it had sold the station and that KENR Management's LMr would be canceled as of Midnight, February 3,1995. The station had been sold to the lalem Communications group (Salem) which would be operating in Houston as Sc th Texas Broadcasting, Inc. At the same time, Salem had purchased KKZR-FM. a Cc troe, Texas licensed FM which serves the Houston metro. Salem's purchase of the two stations would be consummated on the same day, March 3,1995.

KENR Management had received no indication whatever from Susq. channa of the licensee's efforts to sell the KENR. The announcement came as a compile shock to both KENR Management and its quickly growing number of programmers. Inasmuch as Salem operated a large chain of stations which programmed a Christian forr at, it came as no; however, that Salem announced in the press that it would be changing for formats of both KKZR and KENR to Christian programming.

This sale and impending change in format for KENR meant two thir is to KENR Management. First, it meant that the tens of thousands of dollars and thousands of hours of work invested in its Houston LMA were apparently in vein. It meant that KENR Management Company, Inc. faced bankruptcy in spite of the one hundred the usand dollars it would be owed by Susquehanna as compensation for canceling the LMA. Relying on its five year commitment as part of its LMA, KENR Manageme & Company, Inc. had signed a five year lease on studio and office facilities, making thou lands of dollars of leasehold improvements. In addition to loosing its leasehold improvements, it was still responsible for more than \$155,000 in lease payments during the 5 \(\) remaining on its lease. Other contractual commitments would leave KENR Management Company with more than a quarter of a million dollars in obligations and, vithout benefit of the income provided by its programming, only \$100,000 in severance me key to meet those commitments, a bleak circumstance indeed.

Secondly, and perhaps more importantly, the sale meant KENR Ma. Igement could not meet its commitment to its programmers, who in turn, would not 'te able to meet their respective commitments and would no longer be able to provide the programming their communities. Like KENR Management, programmers and invested both time and money in establishing their various blocks of programming. 1994, most of them had been on the air 120 days or less and only then beginning to establish both a substantial audience recognition of their presence and the f ancial support their eventual success would require. In short, loss the outlet at this point would be devastating both financially and in the various communities served by the the air.

h November, groups on

The fiduciary responsibility to its programmers was not taken lightly Management and the decision was made to put forth every effort possible to alternative place on the AM dial for KENR Management's programmers to ploduce their programming. KENR Management commenced conversations with several radio stations concerning the possibility of another LMA to replace that on k ENR; however, no other licensee was receptive to KENR Management's offers.

ly KENR louston area

It was at this point that KENR Management began conversations wit | Salem regarding an extension of its KENR LMA and to look at potential move-in / M's outside the immediate Houston market. Given the fact that Salem had paid \$2.75-m Ilion for KENR, KENR Management knew that no long term LMA extension with Soften would be financially possible. Hence, KENR began discussions with Salem principal Stewart Epperson regarding a short term, one year extension of its Susquehanna LM in order to give it time locate and move an AM in order to have the coverage to support |s programming. During the month of November, 1994 and early December, 1 fr. Epperson gave KENR Management President Don Werlinger repeated verbal assurance is that Salem would entertain such an extension but stated that he would not commit to an agreement until a decision was made on who would manage the Houston properties pur hased by Salem.

In the meantime, an accomplished propogational engineer whose we k has resulted in dozens of AM and FM allocation changes and construction perm a detailed allocation study in an attempt to locate an AM with a potential for bovering the Houston metro. In mid December, Mr. Werlinger discovered KIOX (now F FCC) in Bay City, Texas. Operating with 1.0 kw, non-directional on 1270 kHz, KIOX pt |ced a 0.50 mV/m contour over approximately 15% of the Houston metro from its site i Bay City. It also suffered a tremendous amount of overlap of its 0.50 mV/m contour f. Im KWHI (1280 kHz, 1 kw-ND, D) at Brenham. Werlinger determined that, by reloca KIOX transmitter site, increasing power, and utilizing a directional antenna lystem, KIOX could be improved to cover both the Bay City and Houston markets, accomplishing KENR Management's goal of maintaining a platform for its language programmers.

hternational

Werlinger developed a three pronged plan. First, a new corporation would be formed which would make an offer to purchase KIOX which resulted in the formation of Chameleon Radio Corporation. At the same time, Werlinger determined to diligently with Salem on a one year extension of KENR Management's LN A on KENR since Werlinger was aware that it would take six months or longer to first o tain the KIOX license and then to obtain the construction permit (CP) necessary to changes in KIOX. Finally, once KIOX was purchased, KENR Managemer, would remain programming KENR while the KIOX CP was obtained and the new constructed.

work ake the facility

Without being specific as to which station was to be purchased, Werl ager related his plan to Mr. Epperson of Salem who agreed the plan had merit and again tated Salem's desire to work with KENR Management on an extension of its KEN & LMA. In late December, 1994, Mr. Epperson introduced Jamie Clark as the individual who would be operating Salem's AM/FM operation in Houston.

Werlinger and Clark met twice at KENR Management's offices in D 1994. During the first meeting which occurred on or about December 21st, explained his company's business to Clark and explained his plans to take h programming concept to a station he would purchase. At that meeting, Mr. he was impressed with "what you've built here," and expressed his interest i purchase of KENR Management's programming contracts. Clark said he will to Salem's California headquarters but would be back in Houston in a week discuss the entire situation.

tember, Verlinger Dark stated Salem's returning further

On Clark's second visit which occurred on or about December 28,19 4, he asked to examine KENR Management's contracts and was allowed to do so. Alth ligh reluctant to allow the inspection, Werlinger knew that as the licensee, Salem would have the right to examine the paperwork, so it was allowed. It was after his inspection of the contracts that Clark first stated that he was certain Salem would have no interest in pu thasing all the programming from KENR Management since a number of programmer: tepresented non-Christian faiths (Hindu, Muslim, etc.) which would not fit with Salem's blans for Christian programming for at least part of the day on KENR.

Clark suggested that, instead of entering into an LMA extension, the would rather hire Werlinger as an independent contractor who would place (supposedly programming from KENR Management) on KENR. It became clear during the conversation that Clark had an interest in acquiring most of KENR Man gement's English language and secular international language programming but was in any programming which was religious and non-Christian in nature. While such religious programming represented only 25% of KENR Management's total airtime commitments, numerically, the majority of programmers would be effected and would be left with no place to produce their programming.

Salem ogramming bt interested

Werlinger told Clark he had no interest whatever in becoming an age ht for Salem. He restated his interest in entering into a one year extension of the LMA he had with Susquehanna so as to have the time necessary to acquire another station up which to place his programming. However, the offer to acquire Mr. Werlinger's ser ices as an agent of Salem would resurface four more times prior to May 8,1995. Each time Mr. Werlinger would politely refuse the offer. In light of the record since that the, it is now clear that Mr. Clark returned to California at the end of December, 1994 an |developed a business plan for KENR which included a large portion of KENR Manager ent's programmers.

In the four weeks which followed, KENR Management learned that alem planned to consummate its purchase of both KENR and KKZR on March 3, 195 in Washington, DC. Through a series of conversations with Susquehanna vice Charles Morgan and Salem principal Stewart Epperson, it was decided that Susquehanna's LMA with KENR Management would be extended from Fet to March 3,1995 under the same terms as before the termination notification in November, 1994. On March 3,1995, a one year LMA was to be executed with Salem which was identical to the Susquehanna LMA with two exceptions. The first was that the mould increase to \$20,000.00 from the \$15,000.00 in the Susquehanna LMA. Though 25% more expensive than the Susquehanna LMA, the one year LMA with Salem would allow KENR Management the time necessary to provide itself with another which to place its programmers and continue the service it had begun nearly a year earlier.

In early February, the principals of KENR Management Company, and the name Chameleon Radio Corporation, agreed with Landrum Enters the licensee of radio station KIOX, Bay City, Texas to purchase that facility was to first purchase the station and then present the Commission with an ablication to change the station's city of license to Missouri City, Texas utilizing a new to insmitter site, a directional day/night antenna system to remove much of the previous overlap with KWHI, Brenham, Texas, and dramatically increase the population covered by the 0.5 mV/m contour of the station. During the application and construction process, KENR Management/Chameleon would rely on its one year LMA with Sale to maintain its outlet for its international language programmers. The application seeking transfer of the KIOX license was tendered February 17,1995.

KIOX (KFCC) was an excellent facility for KENR Management's pans. It was one of three (each separately owned) broadcast facilities licensed to Bay City. Its removal to another city of license closer to Houston would leave Bay City with two broadcast outlets, both Class C FM's, and KIOX could become the first service for a community with a much larger population (Missouri City) closer to Houston. In the process, it could dramatically reduce the previously licensed overlap to KW' II in Brenham, Texas.

KIOX had either been simulcasting with its sister FM station or carrying the audio portion of CNN Headline News for a number of years. It had long since ce sed to be a local presence in its community of license and had it not been for ability of its sister FM to cover its operating expenses, KIOX might well have already gone the way of more than two dozen other once thriving Texas AM stations and ceased to exist.

As planned, the Susquehanna/Salem transfer of the KENR license to be March 3,1995 with KENR Management continuing its programming on the station. On March 6,1995, KENR Management concluded a one year LMA with Salem and the bugh sister company Chameleon Radio, was awaiting the transfer of the license on KICK. During

and be on the air in the early fall.

this time, Chameleon was actively engaged in searching for a suitable transi litter site southwest of Houston in order to have a form 301 request ready to present to the Commission as soon as the purchase of the facility could be consummated.

On April 5,1995, Don Werlinger met at the Houston offices of Salen with Jamie Clark. It was on that date Werlinger told Clark that his company in fact, app purchase a station which he planned to relocate and move his programmers.

st and to have a construction permit for the change by August and have construction impleted

Clark expressed surprise as Werlinger's information. He said he had not heard of the purchase by Chameleon but stated that Werlinger's timetable "will prob: bly fit what we doing here with getting the FM up and running." Since KKHT (formerly KKZR) was of course on the air, Werlinger took Clark's statement regarding 'up and run ing' to mean the format on the FM station.

Werlinger told Mr. Clark that he hoped to have the application filed by May

The next day, April 6,1995, Clark wrote the two sentence letter inclu led as Exhibit: 2 and mailed it via first class mail. As the exhibit shows, only one one year agreement, with no violation of that agreement on the part of KEN. Management, Salem, in violation of Section 28 of that agreement (included Exhibit: 3). Section 28 of the agreement is the "Notice" section which state: required hereunder shall be in writing and any payment, notice, or other con hunication shall be deemed given when delivered personally, or mailed by certified mai Express, postage prepaid...". Inasmuch as the "notice" sent from Clark's off the to KENR Management was delivered on Monday, April 9th, via ordinary first class m personally, certified mail, or Federal Express, KENR Management elected to fignore the effective date of 12:00 am, Sunday, May 7,1995.

onth into a erewith as "any notice or Federal l and not

Two days later, April 11,1995, Werlinger was contacted by a programmer who indicated he had been approached by Jamie Clark regarding programming of KENR after May 7th. Such contact was clearly in violation of Section 13 of the LMA; h wever, inasmuch as Salem paid not attention to the Notice provisions of the contrac prohibition against tampering with KENR Management's clients would mee | little.

a simple

The situation became clear; prior to Werlinger's conversation with Cark on April 5th, Salem had been under the impression that KENR Management would bounable to find another facility to which he could take his programmers and, at a time convenient to Salem, it could simply give KENR Management notice of termination and take the programmers it wished to keep, those which would pose no problems with it more numerous Christian programmers, and disregard the rest. When Werlinger c sclosed on April 5th that a facility had been purchased and laid out a reasonable time ta le for accomplishing his stated goal of moving his programmers to that new facilit it became apparent to Salem that KENR Management did indeed have a viable alternative. If the opportunity to cherry pick KENR Management's list of clients were to be re lized, it had

to occur quickly, hence the letter of termination dated April 6th, signed not by an officer of the corporation, but a hireling, and issued so quickly that no attention wa paid to proper delivery to conform to the terms of the contract.

It was at this point that KENR Management made two key decision: elected for the time being to ignore Salem's "letter of termination." Second y, the company moved ahead with all haste toward finding an acceptable transmit is site in southwest Houston to which it could move. A site was found in rural Harri: County between the cities of Houston, Missouri City, and Stafford which would accummodate the daytime antenna array, but which at least initially, looked as though it would not work for the night array.

First, it

In order to accommodate the night pattern, KENR Management corr henced negotiations with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to make use on a lease lasis, of a portion of the Addicks Reservoir just west of Beltway 8 and north of Interst |e 10. Though Corps personnel were very accommodating and made a diligent eff. It to find an area inside the reservoir, no suitable location could be found and it was decided to place the night array with the day array at the Riceville School Road site (See: Fr in 301 with exhibits).

KENR Management/Chameleon realized it was dealing with a preda pry entity in Salem Communications and that it now had only a matter of weeks (not mo: hs as previously planned) before it had to be in place with another facility. The only possible chance for remaining a viable company lay in somehow receiving permissic to make a change in the KIOX transmitter site through temporary authority and then passenting a completed FCC form 301 at a later date.

The decision was made to seek Special Temporary Authorization (S" A) to relocate the KIOX (KFCC) transmitter site to the southwest Houston locatio | while the Form 301. Immediately following closing on April 20,1995, Chameleon sc Ight an STA for the Houston site with a request for 1,000 watts daytime and 250 watts at light. The proposal sought to construct a new tower at the site which would become a just of what was then believed would be a three tower array. Eventually, in order to accommodate the night array, a fourth tower was utilized in the proposal.

John Vu, a member of the FCC's AM Branch staff, indicated he could STA for the site, but would not allow the construction of a new tower for this Mr. Werlinger, who had either been a principal or a consultant in a number (requests through the years, reminded Mr. Vu of the fact that his predecessor. May Bradfield, had routinely granted construction of new towers in such cases. 1 | fact, it is a virtual impossibility to use anything other than a newly constructed tower in AM STA's inasmuch as the guywires on any AM tower must be insulated with in-line in sulators in order to accommodate the AM antenna.

grant an purpose. STA

7135648653

Though Mr. Werlinger repeatedly argued his case with Mr. Vu regar ling the tower construction. He pointed to several STA's in which he was aware the Ms. Bradfield had routinely granted minimum tower construction. He indicated that he had sought at least verbal clearance with the Federal Aviation Administration's buthwest Regional Office in Ft. Worth and had been assured by Bruce Beard of the F. A that the proposed 180' tower would not violate FAA minimums and as far as the FA was concerned, there wasn't even the need for filing an FAA form 7460-1. Mr. Verlinger did; however, file the form to be conservative. Mr. Vu remained adamant that no new construction could take place.

During the course of a conversation on Tuesday, April 26,1995, with Joe McClish of Economy RF Construction Company, an Austin, Texas communications wer erection company, Mr. McClish asked Mr. Werlinger if he (McClish) would be prohibited from erecting a tower 180 feet in height and leasing the tower to [hameleon once and if the STA were permitted. Mr. Werlinger relayed the FAA's opir on that a tower of that height would need no FAA filing. He also made it clear to M | McClish that he (Werlinger) had no authority from the FCC to commission construct on of a tower and could not commit KIOX (KFCC) to using any such tower until and unless the STA was granted.

Mr. McClish stated he was aware of the fact that he was at risk of constructing a tower for which he would have no immediate tenant unless the STA request by Chameleon was approved. Nevertheless, he stated that if Chameleon would grant use of its land (which Chameleon held under a lease/purchase agreement) on a rea: |nably priced basis, his company would like to erect a tower and rent space to other tenan if Chameleon could not make use of the tower. Werlinger agreed and McClis would have a tower erected prior to May 1,1995.

stated he

On Saturday, April 29th, Mr. McClish drove from Austin and did the preparation work for the tower including pouring concrete foundations. By Monday, N by 1,1995 the Rohn model 25 tower was in place; however, nothing relating to a broadca: |tower was on the site with the exception in line insulators in the guywires. All work was done at McClish's expense. No funds were passed from Chameleon or any principal in Chameleon toward the construction of the tower. In fact, nothing relating to broadcast equipment was placed on the site until after the grant of the STA. The folder unipole and ground system were installed on the tower owned by McClish following gra at of the STA.

Although Mr. McClish had reasonable assurance from Chameleon that they would have a use for the tower in the not distant future, until the STA was actually tranted, Mr. McClish had constructed a tower at his own risk with no funding from Chardeleon and no formal agreement that any use of the tower would be made by KIOX (KFC) prior to grant of the STA.

The tower was on land held under a lease purchase agreement by Chameleon; therefore, when Mr. Werlinger reported to Mr. Vu on Monday, May 1,1995 hat a tower was on the land and available for use by Chameleon, he in fact, was reportir 1 the truth.

It was Friday, April 28,1995 that Mr. Werlinger first heard from Jan e Clark regarding the April 6th "termination notice." Other than the first class mail d letter, nothing had been heard from Salem since Mr. Werlinger met with Mr. Clarl on April 5th. In his telephone call on April 28th, Mr. Clark stated that he was calling to " lart getting things wrapped up before we take over next week."

Werlinger stated he didn't know what Clark was talking about where upon Clark referred to the letter. Mr. Werlinger stated that, even if KENR Managemen had received a letter from Salem, such a letter was delivered not by the terms of the contuct, but rather by first class mail and as a result, KENR Management did not regard the let as proper Mr. Werlinger stated that Salem would be receiving KENR Mana ement's notice of termination on Monday, May 1st and that KENR Management would consider the May 31st date the final day of the LMA. After some protestations, Mr. lark told Mr. Werlinger that KENR Management would be hearing from Salem's legal collinsel and hung up. No communication was forthcoming from Salem for the next six ys.

rmination

That same day, April 28,1995, KENR Management indeed issued a notice to Salem Communications, delivered properly on May 1,1995, termi ating the contract as of May 31,1995. The reasoning behind the termination notice f | m KENR Management was Mr. Werlinger knew that, while Salem might argue that the lir letter had been a notice to terminate, it clearly violated terms of the LMA. Werlinger presentation and proper delivery of a May 31st termination letter would clearly establish date later than May 6th as the final date of the LMA.

At that point, Mr. Werlinger had an assurance from John Vu at the F C that he (Vu) would issue an STA, but the question of a tower was still unanswered.

On Thursday, May 3rd, KENR/KFCC employee Vickey Scott was i formed by a programmer that the programmer intended not to pay its May programming commitment because, "you (KENR Management) will not be on the air after Saturday ni ht." When Ms. Scott asked the source of the programmer's information, she was told that the programmer had received the information from Jamie Clark.

When informed of this information, Mr. Werlinger telephoned Jami Clark to warn Mr. Clark that contact by Salem to solicit business from KENR Mana ment programmers was prohibited by Section 13 of the LMA. Mr. Werlinger demanded that Mr. Clark cease such contact where upon Mr. Clark denied initiating any collated with any KENR Management client and categorically any attempt to maneuver any clents away from KENR Management, a denial which would later be proved to be untri-